



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

*BEOWULF*, 30, 53, 132, 2957. II.

*Bēowulf Scyldinga*, 53b. *Dēad is Æschere*, 132b.

Professor Trautmann (*Bonner Beiträge*, 2, 128) remarks: "*Bēowulf Scyldinga* ist metrisch fehlerhaft und sprachlich auffallend. Kaluza 56 räumt, indem er *Bēowulf Scylding* schreibt, den anstoss weg." Professor Sievers (*Beiträge*, 29, 309) admits the possibility of considering Kaluza's emendation, but only on the supposition that the poet meant to speak of Beowulf as Scyld's son (cf. 4, 1923, 2925, 2965). If, however, he meant to speak of Beowulf as of the line of the Scyldings, the syntax is correct (cf. 374, 676, 1191, 1902, "und was uns hier besonders nahe angeht und metrisch unantastbar ist, Hnæf Scyldinga 1069"). He concludes, "In v. 53 ist nach dem ausgeführten der text je nach dem sinne verschieden zu gestalten, den man der stelle beilegt. Beowulf ist Scylds sohn, also ist eine formel *Bēowulf Scylding* an sich gerechtfertigt. Aber nachdem Scyld selbst kurz vorher, v. 30, als *wine Scyldinga* bezeichnet worden ist, und da im directen anschluss an den mit v. 53 beginnenden satz wieder die *Scyldingas* als geschlecht auftreten, scheint mir die heranziehung des engeren patronymicums *Scylding* = 'sohn des Scyld' doch stilistisch höchst auffällig. Gegenüber den massenhaft auftretenden geschlechtsnamen sind ja diese engeren patronymica in der dichtung überhaupt selten genug, und sie werden in den meisten fällen wol nicht ohne besonderen grund (neueinführung, verdeutlichung u. dgl.) gesetzt sein. Ich kann also die vorgeschlagene lesung keineswegs ohne weiteres acceptieren."

It is not in *Scyldinga*, as Sievers feels convinced, that an emendation should be made. But first, in view of the important metrical detail involved, a brief discussion of it is perhaps permissible.

According to the usual form of statement, the variant of D under consideration forms the second half of a line only by a rare exception. This method of stating the case is really unnecessarily careful. The evidence as exhibited by Sievers in his famous article (*Beiträge*, 10, 233, 255) makes it clear, in point of fact, that this use of the variant is not merely a permissible, though rare, license, but rather positively anomalous and un-

metrical. There can be no doubt regarding the examples under Sievers's tentative classes *a*, *b*, *c*, including cases with forms of *dōgor* and *ænig*, *neosian*, (*ge-*) *trūwode*. With proper substitution of original forms, they plainly fall under type A, and cannot be regarded as D's. The examples with *wāpen*, *wundor*, *dohtor*, *þeoden*, in *d* and *e* are ordinary D's under the law by which such words may function as monosyllables (*Grundriss*<sup>2</sup>, II, 2, 31). There are left *oftost wisode*, 1664 (dittography: read *oft*); *laðra owihte*, 2433 (elision, or read *wihte*); *wundor is to secganne* (read *secgan*), and the two lines we are considering. It is no accident that, for all but two of these lines, emendations readily offer themselves; that the emendations are of such a character that they recommend themselves independently to acceptance; and that by their means the half lines are reduced in each case to the normal type. Further, though there is no reason why D2 should not display a parallel variant (as in the first half line), yet in no case does it do so.

It is worth while to review the evidence thus briefly in order to emphasize the conclusion that use of this type of D in the second half line is not a license, but an anomaly. Excluding possible E's, the two cases we are considering alone remain out of 342 sure D's. What may be said of these two? It would, of course, be foolish to expect that any poem should be metrically impeccable, but on the other hand, especially as regards any special detail, the presumption is that it will prove to be so, or that it was originally so. In other words, it is reasonable to expect that these two apparent exceptions will be found to be only apparent and that the conclusion, already indicated clearly, will be further and finally substantiated by their resolution.

A special point of interest attaches to the emendation proposed for l. 53b, *Bēowulf Scyldinga*, which forms the text of this discussion. The appearance of the name Beowulf, the same name as that borne by the hero of the poem, to denote the son of Scyld, has not received sufficient consideration. Why should the name so appear? Its use in this way is unsupported outside the poem. It may therefore be confidently urged that here, originally, the son of Scyld appeared under his proper title *Bēaw* (or *Bēow*) as it appears in the

*Chronicle*, *Beaw Scealdwaing*, A; *Beaw Scealdwearing*, -waing, B. C.; *Beaw Scealdwaing*, D (Thorpe, 1861, 1, 126); compare *Beaw Scealdwaging*, Cotton Ms. Tiberius B. V. (*Reliquae Antiquae*, Wright and Halliwell, 1841-43, II, 173). I cite these from Max Förster's most helpful *Beowulf-Materialien*, 1900, p. 4. An older version of the poem, in brief, read *Bēaw* (*Bēow*) *Scyldinga* and the meter was irreproachable. *Bēaw* (*Bēow*) also fits in metrically in l. 18, *Bēaw wæs brēme*. The scribe (whom we have reason to believe was far from intelligent in his copying), knowing he was to write the story of Beowulf, assumed an error in the *Bēaw* (*Bēow*) of his original, and changed it to *Bēowulf*.

This emendation, it will be seen, supports Sievers in his feeling that a change of *Scyldinga* to *Scylding* is not justified. In addition to the reasons which Sievers gives, it would seem that the context renders it more likely that the poet would have here spoken of *Bēowulf* (*Bēaw*) as a *Scylding* rather than as the son of *Scyld*. It is true that the attribution of sonship might seem to look forward to *fæder ellor hwearf* two lines below, or in some measure backward to the account just given of *Scyld*'s death and the surrender of his body to the sea,—but the interjected phrase needs no such preparation, the statement of his son's repute (now that he is gone) being sufficient and wholly in accord with epic style in itself. Moreover, emphasis is laid in the statement upon the king's relation to his people *on burgum . . . folcum gefræge*. Indeed, the passage is significantly parallel to the passage above, ll. 30 f., not only in the *wine Scyldinga*, to which Sievers adverted, but in the whole context. In both cases, the relation of king to people is in mind, and as this led to the use of *Scyldinga* in a phrase describing *Scyld*, so here we may feel sure that the poet referred to Beowulf as a *Scylding* rather than as a son of *Scyld*.

In brief, it would appear that the anomalous character of the half-line and its correction by the emendation proposed affords satisfactory evidence permitting the removal of an awkwardness from the poem, always felt to be such by its readers, the double use of the name Beowulf, and the restoration of the rightful name of Hrothgar's divine ancestor.

For the remaining anomalous half-line, *Dead is Æschere*, 132b, I would suggest an explanation rather than an emendation. The name *Æschere* undoubtedly existed in Anglo-Saxon, though not recorded elsewhere than here, among numerous other compounds with *Æsc*; compare the eleven forms listed by Binz, *Beiträge*, 20, 177—Binz notes "ein Nordländer scheint *Æscar steallere*, a. 1047-52, Bi. 3, 980 zu sein." May not the Anglo-Saxon form of the name have been substituted for an original Danish \**Asker*, \**Askar*? This question, were it entered into fully in all it involves, would lead far afield into a consideration of the question how the epic lays which formed a basis for Beowulf reached England and where they grew up. The subject is one full of interest and even not devoid of entertainment, considering some of the theories advanced, but it is not necessary to take it up in detail. Whether these lays were brought by gleeman or returned missionary, adventitious outlaw or invader *dans le mouvement*, whether by West German or North German, before or after the close of the eighth century, the important point here is that there is no difficulty in assuming that the original had here the true Danish name. Anywhere within or in the neighborhood of the homes of Hrothgar or of Beowulf, the Danish name would naturally have been used. If, indeed, the original lays were Scandinavian (an interesting possibility, or even probability, albeit the evidence in this direction is not conclusive), the line may even have read originally *Danþr es Askar*. At all events, supposing the Danish name to have stood in the original, there was substituted for it, earlier or later, the Anglo-Saxon form. So long as the Danish form may have stood in the half line, it was a normal A. In following an original, the gleeman or scribe who made the substitution might well have disregarded a metrical anomaly thus produced. But this need not be supposed. The Anglo-Saxon form with palatal *sc* and silent *h*, leaving the first syllable short, afforded an A with resolution of the second thesis.

If this explanation is accepted, the metrical anomaly in the half line disappears, whatever the provenience of the poem, and no case is left of a D in the second half of the line with an extra syllable in the first foot. The conclusion already

clearly indicated by the evidence adduced by Sievers is thus further and finally confirmed. Unless this conclusion were correct, it would not be possible that for each of a series of apparent exceptions an explanation should offer itself that naturally and simply, without violence to probability, leads to a resolution of the anomalous half line concerned to normal.

*pā wecs tēht boden*  
*Swēona leodum, segn Higēlāce :*  
*freoðo-wong þone forð oferēodon,*  
*syððan Hreðlingas tō hagan þrungon. 2757 ff.*

The familiar interpretations or emendations for this passage can none of them be regarded as satisfactory. Cosijn's interpretation, supporting that of Grein and Heyne, maintains the propriety of assuming zengma in *boden*; "chase was then given to the Swede-folk, their banner to Hygelac," but, as Wyatt says, "it is a far cry from giving chase to the capture of the banner, not to mention the violent zeugma in *boden*." The reading adopted by Wyatt, that of Kemble followed by Bugge, which changes *Higēlāce* to *Higēlāces* with the explanation that the standard of Hygelac is the "merkmal der verfolgung," is no better, indeed not so good. Schröder's translation, with change of *leodum* to *leoda*, "then was treasure, the banner, of the Swede-folk, offered to Hygelac (to buy him off,)" may be passed by without comment.

The following reading suggests itself:

*pā wecs tēht boden*  
*Swēona leodum; segn Higēlāces*  
*freoðo-wong þone forð oferēodon,*  
*syððan Hreðlingas tō hagan þrungon.*

The translation would then be: 'Ongentheow had heard tell of Hygelac's prowess in war . . . trusted not to withstand him . . . the old man bent him back then to his wall of earth. Chase then was given to the Swede-folk; the standards of Hygelac went forth over the plain of peace, after the Hrethlings had pressed on to their fastness.'

This reading assumes that *segn* is a neuter nominative plural, not a singular. The gender of *segn* is indeterminate in the poem, as elsewhere, but the use made of it in the different genders significantly supports the proposed reading. The examples are *segn gylðenne*, 47, 1021, but *segn eall-gylðen*, 2767. That is, the gender changes

as the meter requires it. In the case before us the neuter nominative plural affords a perfect line, while the masculine, *segnas*, would have afforded a half line presenting the anomaly just discussed in the previous article.

It may perhaps be questioned whether the poet would have spoken of standards in the plural with reference to Hygelac's host. That there were a number of standards in an Anglo-Saxon army, whether of the king himself or his more important followers, as emblems of lordship or for military purposes, need not be questioned. Banners were borne before King Edwin both in war and peace (Bede, II, 16 : Miller, I, 145 f.): "Swelce he hæfde swa micle heannisse in þæm cynerice, þætte nales þæt aan þæt heo segn [*vexilla*] fore him bæron sæt gefeohte, ac eac swylce in sibbe tiide, þær he rad betweoh his hamum oðpe be tunum mid his pegnum, ge peah he eode, þæt him mon symle þæt tacn beforan bær." The hedge of banners (*Juliana*, 395) and the banners under which the brave fight, referred to in *Judith*, 333, do not denote simply opposed banners. In *Andreas* there is an explicit reference to the banners of a single host to *weallgeatum wigend þrungon, cene under cumbblum*, 1203. The best passage for our purpose, however, is one in which the poet of the *Exodus* is speaking of the host of Israel, *sungon sigebȳman, segnas stōdon on fægerne sweg*, 566, where not only a number of banners is indicated, but also their movement typifies that of the army.

It will be noted that while the parallelism of the ms. reading disappears, another at longer range takes its place.

The omission of the *s* in *Higēlāces* may have been merely accidental, or it may have been due to mechanical syntactic habit owing to the assumption of a parallelism there closed, particularly as the ms. reading is not absolutely impossible, despite the zeugma. It is the violence of the zeugma, and the brevity of the reference, whether referring to an incidental capture of the banner or whether proleptic in character, which render the correctness of the ms. reading highly improbable. The reading proposed is, I venture to hope, syntactically sound, clear in meaning, and consistent with the epic rhetoric.

C. G. CHILD.

*University of Pennsylvania.*